

СВІТОВЕ ГОСПОДАРСТВО І МІЖНАРОДНІ ЕКОНОМІЧНІ ВІДНОСИНИ

УДК 412.23.51

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32840/1814-1161/2021-4-1>

Duginets Ganna

Doctor of Economics, Professor,
Head of the Department of World Economy
Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics

Busarieva Tetiana

Ph.D. in Economics, Associate Professor,
Specialist for Ensuring the Work of the Supervisory Board of NPC "Ukrenergo"

Дугінець А.В.

доктор економічних наук, професор,
завідувач кафедри світової економіки
Київського національного торговельно-економічного університету

Бусарєва Т.Г.

кандидат економічних наук, доцент,
фахівець з забезпечення роботи Наглядової Ради НЕК «Укренерго»

CHARACTERISTICS OF MODERN FEATURES OF «HYBRID WAR»

ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКА СУЧАСНИХ ОСОБЛИВОСТЕЙ «ГІБРИДНОЇ ВІЙНИ»

The emergence of global universal human solidarity acts as a historical pattern. The operation of this pattern in the process of globalization together with the implementation of the concept of sustainable development is at the very beginning. It is still far from the creation of a single global world, but the movement of the world community towards it has been steadily continuing since the emergence of mankind. It is obvious that the development of military operations, which we are witnessing, has long been not associated with serious breakthroughs in the field of science and technology. These factors act rather as concomitant ones. The basis of superiority on the battlefield is the ability to think strategically, as well as to use non-standard combat techniques, starting not only from the level of weapons and combat effectiveness, but also based on the cultural characteristics and even, in a sense, the mentality of the parties to the conflict. Considering the theoretical and methodological aspects of the problem, in our opinion, it is necessary to set a certain coordinate system to determine the nature and specifics of a hybrid conflict in two planes – directions (economic, military, cultural, international, socio-political, domestic, informational), as well as tools (the strategy of controlled chaos, the doctrine of "soft power", the doctrine of color revolutions, the theory of reflexive control, the doctrine of unlimited war, the doctrine of rebelliousness, the doctrine of network-centric war, the concept of asymmetric war). Also, referring to applied research, one should take into account the chronological characteristics and specifics of hybrid conflicts, which are segmented within three stages – hidden (latent), semi-open and open.

Key words: hybrid war, modern conflict, scientific and technological development, cyber war, asymmetric war, strategy.

Становлення глобальної, загальнолюдської солідарності виступає як історична закономірність. Дія цієї закономірності в процесі глобалізації спільно з реалізацією концепції стійкого розвитку знаходиться на самому початку. До створення єдиного глобального світу ще далеко, але рух світової спільноти до нього неухильно продовжується з моменту виникнення людства. Очевидно, що розвиток військових дій, свідками яких ми є, вже давно не пов'язане з серйозними проривами в області науки і техніки. Ці чинники

виступають, скоріше, як супутні. Основою ж переваги на полі бою стає вміння стратегічно мислити, а також використовувати нестандартні техніки ведення бою, відштовхуючись не тільки від рівня озброєння і боездатності, а й виходячи з особливостей культури і навіть в деякому сенсі менталітету учасників конфлікту. В останні три роки термін «гібридна війна» активно застосовується в політичній і політологічній середовищах, проте правові аспекти даного явища поки залишаються недостатньо вивченими. В результаті створюється небезпечна ситуація, коли термін, що відображає тенденції в сфері військово-силового та інформаційної взаємодії держав, поступово впроваджується в наукову та експертну термінологію, не володіючи при цьому чітким правовим змістом. В даний час ведеться серйозна дискусія про допустимість використання даного терміну в правовому контексті і про можливості його подальшого включення в міжнародно-правову термінологію. Феномен «гібридної війни» демонструє різке збільшення значущості інформаційного компонента в міжнародних відносинах, а також є закономірним продовженням реалізації концепцій «кольорових революцій» і «арабських весен», які передбачають не силового вплив на супротивника. Перспективи включення терміну «гібридна війна» в апарат міжнародного права вельми туманні з урахуванням того, що вже більше 30 років існує міжнародно-правовий термін «державний тероризм» з дуже схожим змістовим наповненням, який так і не став предметом міжнародно-правового регулювання на рівні спеціалізованої конвенції. Можна також констатувати, що «гібридна війна» стала основним терміном для позначення дій держав, що не вписуються в рамки традиційної військово-силової парадигми, і це вкрай негативно позначається на перспективах нормативно-правового регулювання даного явища. Крім того, інформаційно-комунікаційна сфера в силу її динамізму є занадто складним об'єктом міжнародно-правового регулювання.

Ключові слова: гібридна війна, сучасний конфлікт, науково-технологічний розвитку, кібервійна, асиметрична війна, стратегія.

Становление глобальной, общечеловеческой солидарности выступает как историческая закономерность. Действие данной закономерности в процессе глобализации совместно с реализацией концепции устойчивого развития находится в самом начале. До создания единого глобального мира еще далеко, но движение мирового сообщества к нему неуклонно продолжается с момента возникновения человечества. Очевидно, что развитие военных действий, свидетелями которых мы являемся, уже давно не связано с серьезными прорывами в области науки и техники. Эти факторы выступают, скорее, как сопутствующие. Основой же превосходства на поле сражений становится умение стратегически мыслить, а также использовать нестандартные техники ведения боя, отталкиваясь не только от уровня вооружения и боеспособности, но и исходя из особенностей культуры и даже в некотором смысле менталитета участников конфликта.

Ключевые слова: гибридная война, современный конфликт, научно-технологический развития, кибервойна, асимметричная война, стратегия.

Problem statement. Hybrid warfare is a product of the Third Scientific and Technical revolution; therefore, as the very concept of hybrid war, and its tools, forms of action and protection are the brainchildren of this modern scientific and technological revolution. Accordingly, any borrowing from the strategic or tactical arsenal of wars of past eras is quite possible, but they must be rethought and transformed precisely in the context of the situation created by the modern scientific and technological revolution. The third scientific and technological revolution created such means of warfare that are in principle all-encompassing and all-pervading. First of all, it is about modern information and communication systems (networks), which today cover all areas social production, consumption, delivery, protection, etc. In other words, modern society has entered the phase of general and pervasive risk [Yanitsky, 2000]. In turn, this means that today there are no more absolutely safe places - there are only places more or less safe, and the degree of risk for specific places all the time is changing. In general, concepts such as "territory", "boundary" or "Border" become relative: in modern war there is no front, no rear, no flanks in our usual sense. All the places are potentially vulnerable, the only question is the degree of reliability of their protection. Hybrid warfare is mobile warfare. Based on the mentioned above it is very important to analyze the modern specific characteristics of the hybrid warfare.

Analysis of recent research and publications.

Among scientific researches in the field of knowledge component of competitiveness, Ukrainian and foreign scientists have developed a number of theoretical, methodological and methodical approaches to determining the place and role of hybrid warfare in modern globalization are D. Adair, M. Bauer, B. Bass, W. Bayhem, F. Bailey, K. Byrd, W. Bennis, K. Blanchard, R. Blake, J. Blondel, E. Borgat, M. Weber, K. De Vries, V. Vroom, R. Wood, M. Hunter, R. Greenleaf, S. Green, M. Martynenko, A. Degtyar and M. Bublik, A. Nalyvaiko, N. Butenko, N. Smolinska and I. Hrybyk, S. Leonov and other scientists. At the same time, it is important to note that at the beginning of the 21st century there have been created many new features of the hybrid war, that are necessary to analyze.

Formulation of the aims of the article. The main purpose of the article is to analyze the specific characteristics of the hybrid war that are formed caused by the scientific and technical progress.

Presenting main materials. Today we can assert about the specific features of the hybrid war, which are manifested in the choice of direction. The information direction, as a rule, is represented by actions aimed at actively promoting alien political ideas, moral and ethical principles, seizing the national information field (promoting foreign media, taking control of national ones), saturating the national information field with

negative information (fakes). The continuation of the information direction is cyber war, which involves the deployment of confrontations in the Internet space. Key elements include dDos and phishing attacks, the use of OSINT technologies (collection of information in open sources) and Humint (formation of insider networks). The main task of actions in this direction is to get the opportunity to manage the emotional state of key persons (leaders of public opinion) or society as a whole.

The cultural direction is represented by humanitarian aggression aimed at destroying the national heritage (architecture, artifacts), direct or indirect actions aimed at limiting the language of the titular nation, negativizing national culture and traditions, imposing foreign mass culture (cinema, literature, theater, fine arts, etc.), as well as the negativization of the moral authorities of the nation (workers of culture, art, science). The main goal of the attacks is to show the failure of the nation, the lack of a historical past and prospects for the future.

The concept of asymmetric warfare (proposed in 1975 by Andrew Mac) involves the concentration of resources and efforts of the attacking side to strike at the enemy in an unexpected way and in an unexpected place. Typical signs of asymmetric confrontation are: opposing technological advantages to quantitative ones, attacks on enemy infrastructure, striking weakly defended places, non-standard tactics, unexpected decisions (going against international conventions and humanitarian principles). In military operations, this concept involves the use of mobile warfare tactics, the use of special operations forces or private military companies [1].

The controlled chaos strategy (proposed in 1992 by Stephen Mann) involves a set of actions aimed at introducing the society of the attacked side into a state of "political criticality" that blocks or destroys its key institutions. Among the typical signs that are peculiar markers of the use of this strategy, one can single out: attacks on national cultural identity, the formation of a state of hopelessness in society, the creation of totalitarian ideologies and cults, the atomization of society, the concentration of public attention exclusively on material problems, the stimulation of corruption, the activation of ideological faults, society, the negativization of the authority of state power, the formation of conditions for the outbreak of a civil war or the imposition of its ideas on society, stimulation of economic problems.

The doctrine of "soft power" (proposed in 1990 by Joseph Nye) presupposes the implementation by the attacker of a set of actions that demonstrate their own advantages to the enemy. Such demonstration actions are aimed at influencing the emotional state of the enemy's key personalities or its society as a whole. In this case, the attacking side has the opportunity to manage or have a significant impact on public life, economy, foreign and domestic policies of the attacked side [2].

The doctrine of color revolutions (proposed in 1993 by Gene Sharp) presupposes the organization and implementation of mass social movements, the purpose of which is the non-violent change of the political system or the governing elite of society. As a rule, innovators become the initiators of color revolutions (10–15% of

the total population), and the middle class (50–60% of the total population) becomes the driving force that is imbued with innovative ideas and brings about changes in society. Typical examples of such revolutions are the "Velvet Revolution" in Czechoslovakia (1989), "Bulldozer Revolution" in Yugoslavia (2000), "Rose Revolution" in Georgia (2003), "Tulip Revolution" in Kyrgyzstan (2005), "Brick Revolution" in Moldova (2009), "Jasmine revolution" in Tunisia (2011), etc.

The theory of reflective control (proposed at the end of the 60s of the 20th century on the basis of V. Lefebvre's developments) involves the use of complex tools that allow you to influence the adversary's making decisions that are beneficial to the attacking side due to the creation of certain situations or the demonstration of potential threats. The main methods of achieving the above task are: distraction of attention, the formation of a dense information flow, the processing of which requires significant resources, the introduction into a state of cognitive dissonance with the blocking of the decision-making function, the depletion of the enemy's resources for solving insignificant tasks or fake threats, stimulating contradictions among allies, lulling vigilance (reducing tension or transferring processes to a hidden format), provoking rash decisions and actions, psychological pressure and intimidation.

The doctrine of unrestricted war (developed in the 1990s by Qiao Liang on the basis of the principles of unrestricted submarine warfare that took place during World War II) involves the implementation of aggressive actions that are not regulated by time frames (cyclical processes) or restraining principles (moral and ethical norms or international conventions) [3].

The doctrine of insurgency (proposed in the 1960s by Evgeny Messner) involves the formation and support of active legal protest movements and underground groups that operate through aggressive propaganda campaigns and demonstrative terrorist acts. The action of these subjects is aimed at eliminating moral values, moral (scandals, slander, compromising evidence) and physical (demonstrative attempts) destruction of leaders of public opinion. Terrorist acts aimed at the seizure or destruction of objects of national historical heritage (historical and natural reserves, individual architectural objects) and symbolic objects (monuments to heroes, events, objects of worship) can be carried out in a more severe form.

The network-centric war doctrine (a mix of the American military doctrines "Joint Vision 2010" and "Joint Vision 2020") is a set of measures aimed at concentrating the information and communication resources of the attacking side, which are necessary to ensure operational and effective control of military operations (automated control systems). Also, the key task of the actions of the attacking side is to block and destroy the information potential. The theory of network information warfare (presented in 2016 by the author of the article) involves the integrated use of digital, humanitarian (managerial) and psychotechnologies to coordinate information processes (creation, distribution, search for content) in social online networks.

Chronologically, a hybrid conflict is traditionally divided into three stages: preparatory, active and final.

Based on the peculiarities and specifics of the latest, most resonant hybrid conflicts (Russian-Georgian, Russian-Ukrainian), we propose some correction of the names of the stages and their content. The most appropriate would be segmentation into hidden (latent), half-open and open stages [4].

The latent stage is inherently more consistent with the parameters of our proposed concept of hybrid aggression. Within the framework of this period, the attacking side carries out in relation to its victim the impact of economic, external and internal political nature, information pressure, active pressure in the field of culture. The aggressor side, through the instruments of “soft power”, imposes on the object of aggression its vision of its role and place in the geopolitical situation, forms social attitudes that are beneficial for itself, and corrects the state strategy.

The semi-open stage is a confrontation in a format that corresponds to the concept of hybrid war that we have presented. At this stage, the attacking side switches to demonstrative methods of pressure, using the whole range of methods and directions of destructive influence, excluding direct armed conflict. The attacked side responds to aggression in accordance with its capabilities and in accordance with the actions of the enemy. At this stage, first, the attacking and then the responding side actively uses the tools of such hybrid doctrines as color revolutions, a strategy of controlled chaos, reflexive control, and rebellion [5].

The open phase of a hybrid conflict involves the open use of military forces. If the attacking side does not have an overwhelming advantage, armed clashes are local in nature. They are carried out mainly in the form of mobile clashes, using special operations forces (SOF) or pinpoint military operations with limited use of aviation and artillery. Quite often, such forms of armed confrontation take the form of peace enforcement or peacekeeping operations. At the same time, the most popular form of tactical decisions is the concept of network-centric warfare and asymmetric warfare. In addition to purely military methods, the instruments of the doctrine of unlimited war and the theory of reflexive control are used. They also continue to actively, but already selectively (in order to save resources), use hybrid technologies inherent in the latent stage – controlled chaos, rebelliousness, reflexive control [6].

Conclusion. As a result of large-scale processes and trends taking place in recent decades in the context of globalization and the information revolution, more or less noticeable metamorphoses are undergone forms,

methods, means and, accordingly, the interpretation of national interests and national security. If during the entire previous history of mankind armed power, then in current conditions, along with it, other forms, methods and means are acquiring an ever-growing importance. Such components of the so-called soft power, such as economic, sanctions, image, electronic, propaganda and other means and methods of ideological-information-cultural domination are becoming increasingly important.

References:

1. Filimonov G., Danuik H. (2019) “Gibridnaya voyna”: interpretatsii i realnost. *Svobodnaya mysl*, no. 3(1663), pp. 17–24.
2. Chudina-Shmidt H. (2018) Ekstremalnost – katalisator izmeneniya kulturu. *Ekonomicheskie i gumanitarnui issledovaniya regionov*, no. 5, pp. 62–65.
3. Glenn R.W. (2009) Thoughts on “Hybrid” Conflict. *Small Wars Journal*. March 02. Available at: <http://smallwarsjournal.com/jrnl/art/thoughts-on-hybrid-conflict>.
4. Hoffman F.G. (2017) Conflict in the 21st century. The rise of hybrid wars. Arlington: Potomac Institute for Policy Studies. P. 72.
5. Deelstra T., Yanitsky O. (2018) Cities of Europe: The Public’s Role in Shaping the Urban Environment. Moscow: Mezhdunarudnye Otnosheniya, p. 393
6. Fujita K. (2017) Cities and Crisis. New Critical Urban Theory. London: SAGE, 2013. 325 p.
7. Papademetriou D. (2017) International Migration in a Changing World. *International Social Science Journal*, vol. XXXVI, no. 3, pp. 409–424.

Бібліографічний список:

1. Филимонов Г. Ю., Данюк Н. С. «Гибридная война»: интерпретации и реальность. *Свободная мысль*. 2019. № 3 (1663). С. 17–24.
2. Чудина-Шмидт Н. В. Экстремальность – катализатор изменения культуры. *Экономические и гуманитарные исследования регионов*. 2018. № 5. С. 62–65.
3. Glenn R. W. Thoughts on “Hybrid” Conflict [Электронный ресурс]. *Small Wars Journal*. 2009. March 02. Available at: <http://smallwarsjournal.com/jrnl/art/thoughts-on-hybrid-conflict>.
4. Hoffman F.G. Conflict in the 21st century. The rise of hybrid wars. Arlington : Potomac Institute for Policy Studies, 2017. P. 72.
5. Deelstra T., Yanitsky, O. (eds.) Cities of Europe: The Public’s Role in Shaping the Urban Environment. Moscow : Mezhdunarudnye Otnosheniya, 2018. 393 p.
6. Fujita K. (ed.) Cities and Crisis. New Critical Urban Theory. London : SAGE, 2013. 325 p.
7. Papademetriou D. International Migration in a Changing World. *International Social Science Journal*. 2017. P. 409–424.